

REMARKS

This Response is in reply to the Office Action mailed on December 17, 2004. Claims 1-11 are pending. Claim 12 has been cancelled. No new matter has been added. Entry and consideration of the amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

Drawings

The drawings were objected to by the Examiner because figures 31-34 were distorted photo copies and did not clearly show the convergent limitation. Formal figures 31-36 are being submitted herewith. Therefore the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner's objection be withdrawn.

Rejection Based on Double Patenting

The Examiner provisionally rejected claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as claiming the same subject matter as claim 48 of co-pending U.S. Application No. 10/292,803. Claim 12 has been canceled. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the anticipation rejections be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102(b)

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Adriaenssens et al. (U.S. 6,042,427).

Claim 12 has been canceled. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the anticipation rejection be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 10/714,803
Amdt. dated April 18, 2005
Response to Office Action of Dec. 17, 2004

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103(a)

Claims 1-8, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pinney et al. (U.S. 5,547,405). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 10 and 11 recite a first pair of contact members mounting a plate-like extension oriented in a first direction and a second pair of contact members mounting a plate-like extension oriented in a second direction. The claims specifically recite "the first direction being convergent with the second direction."

In contrast, Pinney describes lateral extensions. Pinney does not describe or suggest a connector or method having a plate-like extension oriented in a first direction and a plate-like extension oriented in a second direction wherein the first direction is convergent with the second direction as specifically recited in the claims.

Furthermore, the Examiner has not presented a reference that describes the numbered configuration of contact members as specifically recited in the claims. Geometry and position of the contact members with respect to each other and the plate-like extensions is critical in order provide an electric connector with enhanced crosstalk compensation features. Also, the Examiner has not presented a reference which recites plate-like extensions oriented in a first and second direction which are convergent as specifically recited in the claims. Therefore, a prima facie case of obviousness has not been met because Pinney does not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations.

Accordingly, the Applicants assert that claims 1, 10 and 11 are patentable over Pinney for the reasons stated above. By reason of their dependency on independent claims, the Applicants

Appl. No. 10/714,803
Amdt. dated April 18, 2005
Response to Office Action of Dec. 17, 2004

assert that claims 2-8 are also patentable over Pinney. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pinney et al. (U.S. 5,547,405) in view of Foster, Jr., deceased et al. (U.S. 5,586,914). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As stated above, Pinney does not describe or suggest a plate-like extension oriented in a first direction and a plate-like extension oriented in a second direction wherein the first direction is convergent with the second direction.

Therefore, the Applicants assert that claim 9 is patentable over Pinney for the same reasons stated above. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 1-8, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Simmel (U.S. 6,290,524). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 10 and 11 recites a first pair of contact members mounting a plate-like extension oriented in a first direction and a second pair of contact members mounting a plate-like extension oriented in a second direction. The claims specifically recite "the first direction being convergent with the second direction."

In contrast, Simmel describes lateral extensions. Simmel does not suggest or describe a

Appl. No. 10/714,803
Amdt. dated April 18, 2005
Response to Office Action of Dec. 17, 2004

connector or method having a plate-like extension oriented in a first direction and a plate-like extension oriented in a second direction wherein the first direction is convergent with the second direction as specifically recited in the claims.

Furthermore, the Examiner has not presented a reference that describes the numbered configuration of contact members as specifically recited in the claims. Geometry and position of the contact members with respect to each other and the plate-like extensions is critical in order provide an electric connector with enhanced crosstalk compensation features. Also, the Examiner has not presented a reference which recites plate-like extensions oriented in a first and second direction which are convergent as specifically recited in the claims. Therefore, a prima facie case of obviousness has not been met because Simmel does not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations.

Accordingly, the Applicants assert that claims 1, 10 and 11 are patentable over Simmel for the reasons stated above. By reason of their dependency on independent claims, the Applicants assert that claims 2-8 are also patentable over Simmel. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Simmel (U.S. 6,290,524) in view of Foster, Jr., deceased et al. (U.S. 5,586,914). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As stated above, Simmel does not describe or suggest a plate-like extension oriented in a first direction and a plate-like extension oriented in a second direction wherein the first direction is

Appl. No. 10/714,803
Amdt. dated April 18, 2005
Response to Office Action of Dec. 17, 2004

convergent with the second direction.

Therefore, the Applicants assert that claim 9 is patentable over Simmel for the same reasons stated above. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 10/714,803
Amtd. dated April 18, 2005
Response to Office Action of Dec. 17, 2004

Conclusion


In view of the amendments to the claims and the arguments presented above, it is submitted that the Examiner's rejections have been overcome and should be withdrawn. The application should now be in condition for allowance.

The Applicants note that there is no indication that the drawings are acceptable. The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide indication that the drawings are accepted by the Examiner in the next formal communication.

Should any changes to the claims and/or specification be deemed necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned to discuss the same.

This Response is being filed with a Petition for a Two-Month Extension of Time. In the event that any other extensions and/or fees are required for the entry of this Response, the Patent and Trademark Office is specifically authorized to charge such fee to Deposit Account No. 50-0518 in the name of Steinberg & Raskin, P.C. An early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
STEINBERG & RASKIN, P.C.

By: 
Dona C. Edwards
Reg. No. 42,507

Steinberg & Raskin, P.C.
1140 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036
(212) 768-3800